ERIC Document Resume	See Instruction Sheet	DATE OF RESUME 7/6/65	DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER	2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S).	3. IDENTIFICATION NO.
ED000916	8515	

DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW

4. AUTHOR(S):
Wilcox, Edward T.

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED:
Harvard University: A Report to the Faculty of Arts and Sciences on the Program of Advanced Standing, 1955-61

6. PUBLICATION TITLE:
N.A.

7. EDITOR(S):
N.A.

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN
ORG. Harvard University
ST. Cambridge, Mass.
CITY, STATE
TELE. EXT
INST/LOC CODE

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE
Harvard University

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
N.A.	N.A.	Mar. 62	16

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE
YES ☑ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED
YES ☐ NO ☒

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED
YES ☐ NO ☐

TYPE OF REPORT
PROPOSAL ☐
IN-PROGRESS ☐
FINAL ☒
FOLLOW-UP ☐

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR
report

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)

students Y-15	programs P-22			
talent Y-19	achievement R-04			
placements P-14				

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

A critical review of the Advanced Placement Program at Harvard. The text is supplemented by figures showing overall growth of the program and student performances in middle-group courses during the first year of residence.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION	20. DIVISION OR DEPT.	21. CONTRACT NO. / PROJECT NO.
	22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT	
	23. DURATION OF PROJECT	U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Office of Education

ERIC Form 1

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

R-7-21 8515

JUL 1 1 1963

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

A Report to the Faculty of Arts and Sciences on the Program of Advanced Standing, 1955-1961

March 6, 1962

8515

ED000916

A REPORT TO THE FACULTY ON THE PROGRAM OF ADVANCED STANDING, 1955–1961

(The following report was presented at the Faculty meeting on March 6, 1962, and, upon a recommendation from the floor has been printed for distribution to the Faculty)

The Program of Advanced Standing has twice before been discussed at length on the floor of the Faculty. Eight years ago, in March 1954, the Faculty was invited to speculate on a series of tentative propositions: if certain secondary schools were to attempt changes in their curricula so that some of their students could undertake work traditionally taught in college; if teachers could be found to instruct at this level; if adequate standards could be found by which to measure substantive achievement — would the Harvard Faculty then be willing to accept for advanced placement here, and even for college credit, college-level work completed in secondary school? At the time these seemed like somewhat fanciful propositions. The theory sounded acceptable, but a pragmatic view suggested that very few secondary schools had the inclination or resources to attempt this kind of work. It was clear, moreover, that any school willing to invest the money and manpower and prepared to initiate complex readjustments in its high school curriculum would want some reassurance that its college-level work would not be repeated in the freshman year, and some tangible evidence that colleges would recognize properly attested work as in fact *college-level* — and creditable as such.

The original debate prompted expressions of skepticism about whether the work could be done, but ultimately we were willing to allow the schools to try. A Program of Advanced Standing was established. Its most dramatic provision was that students who entered Harvard with advanced placement in three or more subjects would be eligible to be placed directly into Sophomore standing.

The Faculty, then, was willing to encourage schools to undertake an extensive program of freshman-year work and to offer the opportunity for exceptionally well-prepared students to move directly into the Sophomore year. At the same time, however, the Faculty was unwilling to allow this encouragement to involve students in a program of forced acceleration. A provision was added to the terms of Sophomore Standing: "Any such student may elect, however, to remain in Harvard College and in a House for four years and may devote as much of his fourth year as he chooses to courses in our Graduate School of Arts and Sciences." The program was adopted in the May meeting.

Five years later the Faculty heard a report on the initial results of the

program they had voted upon, and the news was gratifying. In the interim the direction of the Advanced Placement Program in schools had been taken over by the College Entrance Examination Board. Schools and colleges had worked together to make the program educationally sound. Members of this Faculty had helped set course requirements and establish the examinations to test college-level work. Departments here had administered advanced placement examinations to Harvard freshmen in order to check their validity against our own standards. It was clear in 1959 that the forthright commitment made by this Faculty had lent prestige to a program slowly becoming national in scope. No mention had been made in the original debate of the degree to which our policy might serve to recruit to Harvard students with unusual preparation, and there was no way clearly to demonstrate that it had. But the fact was that Harvard was enrolling a lion's share of the advanced placement candidates in the country. Moreover, evidence was beginning to emerge that these students had been successfully prepared to enter middle-group courses at Harvard. The evidence was by no means conclusive, but for the most part students who had moved directly into middle-group work on the basis of their advanced placement were doing well. It was difficult at that time to say much about the Sophomore Standing Program. Only one student had graduated, and there were still many unknowns.

We were perhaps concerned as well as pleased about the rate of growth. Since there had been initial misgivings about whether the work could be done at all, it was surprising — and perhaps disconcerting — to see it being done by so many. The advanced placement candidates had more than doubled. Students in Sophomore Standing had increased from 2 to 55. In its external impact, the encouragement it was offering to schools and other colleges, Harvard's program was an unquestionable success; but the internal consequences were not clear.

Today, after an additional period of three years, the Program is again before this Faculty for discussion. One need not belabor what was reported in 1959 — that efforts to induce secondary schools to undertake college-level work has met with success. In 1961 over 1000 secondary schools prepared more than 13,000 candidates for advanced placement and sent these candidates to more than 600 colleges and universities. If sheer numbers are any measure, Harvard seems to have maintained its leading role in the Program. And the principle of advanced placement seems now to have national recognition and acceptance.

We have now had seven years of experience. Quite aside from any comments on the national impact of the Program, we can discuss its influence on Harvard undergraduate education, being felt in nearly every sector of the college.

I have prepared and distributed some statistical tables. The first table gives figures on the growth of the Program since 1955. It shows that last September we received advanced placement candidates from over

200 different schools. There were 540 such candidates — about 45 per cent of the incoming class. One hundred thirty-four of these candidates received advanced placement in three or more subjects and were eligible for Sophomore standing.

Some interesting trends emerge from a study of seven years' growth — some of them not apparent from the table itself. Altogether 409 different schools have sent advanced placement students to Harvard. The balance between public and private schools has, as we anticipated, begun to shift — from 52 per cent private schools in 1955 to 41 per cent last September. The majority of the candidates themselves still come from private schools, but here too the growth of the Program on a broader base is being reflected. In 1955, 82 per cent of the candidates came from private schools, last year 65 per cent.

Another prediction seems to be working out. The number of advanced placement candidates at Harvard has begun to level off; the rate of increase has slowed down. Last year there were only ten more candidates than the year before — 540 against 530 — and the number of examinations was substantially the same. This stabilization is, in my view, closely related to the nature of our applicant group and our admissions policy, and suggests that we may be reaching an upper limit in the number of advanced placement candidates who will apply or will be accepted in an incoming class.

At the same time, within this group, the quality of performance on the examinations, reflected in the number of actual advanced placement awards at Harvard, reveals an increasing competence on the part of the students who have taken college-level work in secondary school. This in turn is reflected in an unabating increase in the number of students eligible for Sophomore standing.

Let me put this as starkly as possible. If one conjectures on the growth of Advanced Placement during the next ten years, it seems probable that an upper limit in the number of entering students who have been afforded the opportunity to attend a school (usually suburban or private) that offers advanced placement work is probably five or six hundred — about half of the class. But as this favored group becomes increasingly well trained and as our selection of students within these schools becomes increasingly rigorous, the number of advanced placement candidates who become eligible for Sophomore standing *could* approach 100 per cent: that is, five or six hundred — about half of the class.

I am not certain whether this prospect is alarming or not. I know there are members of the Faculty seated in this room who believe sincerely that any *one* student in Advanced Standing is by definition a "tragic case" and would represent a gross total in the Program of one too many. I know that initial misgivings about the capacity of secondary-school teachers to prepare students for middle-group work remains in the minds of some Harvard professors — forcefully reflected when, Faculty and

Department votes notwithstanding, they begin their classes by identifying the Advanced Placement students in the room and then enliven their first lecture by throwing the hapless miscreants out on their ear. My policy has been gently to introduce these stunned youths to the concept of faculty autonomy and quietly to help them go about choosing another course.

It is against a background of slowly emerging criticism of the Program — some valid, some clearly spurious — that a discussion of growth or curtailment must be undertaken. I would like to deal as rapidly as possible with a central criticism, one that strikes at the very concept of Advanced Placement. Overtly it is expressed when an adviser points to a failing grade in a middle-group course and generalizes about a program that presses innocent children into studies for which they are not prepared; when a tutor reports on a Sophomore standing student whose performance on general examinations has fallen short of the *summa* he presumably would have had without the insidious pressures of Advanced Standing. Covertly the criticism gains strength when AP students are cautioned about intellectual arrogance and reminded that any Harvard course, even repeated work, has unique merit.

The remaining tables before you are meant to demonstrate that Advanced Placement students in middle-group courses are doing well and that the tragedy of Sophomore Standing — at least on the single dimension of academic performance — is a myth.

The tables need little commentary. I should, however, point out that I have defined "advanced course" very rigorously in the departmental tabulations in the second table. I have not included the semi-honors offerings that are open to especially qualified Freshmen without formal advanced placement, though the grade results in these are equally impressive. For example, Chemistry 2 and Biology 2 are not included; the recorded grades are at the level of Chemistry 20 or a 100 course in Biology. Mathematics 11 is not included, nor Physics 12a. Nor is French 20, German 75, Greek or Latin 2, Music 51. Only courses at the 100 level in English and History are tabulated. Moreover, I have not included work done in these advanced courses in later years when, it might legitimately be argued, the influence of secondary school preparation would be less direct. These are the grades of students who entered advanced courses in their first year of residence immediately following a college-level course in secondary school. The evidence is that they are well enough prepared.

In order to avoid fractional grades, I have listed the results in half-course units. Both A's and E's in full courses have been doubled. Because the table lists course-units rather than individuals, there is no way to tell from these statistics how many students went into advanced courses in their first year. Last year the number was 278 — more than one quarter of the class. There will be more this year.

The figures on Sophomore Standing in the third table compare the rank list groups of all Advanced Standing students since 1955 with those of all other students in the college. They are compared by year of residence rather than class. The Sophomore Standing students' performance in the first year, while it argues for a capacity to undertake advanced work, has been denigrated by some who argue that this is a foregone conclusion: Freshman courses are graded more rigorously than middle-group offerings. But this would not account for the later years when the Advanced Standing students appear to maintain and improve the margin of their superior performance. And it would certainly not account for the fact that, of those who have graduated, almost half have received degrees of *magna* or better.

More could be adduced from these figures. For example, they call into question assumptions I know to be current — that Advanced Standing students falter badly in their first traumatic year, or that they fade badly in a premature year of thesis or generals. In many ways the tables tend to provoke discussion on a false premise, since theoretically we hoped these students would do *as well* as other undergraduates, and have no particular basis for expecting them to do better.

I have two final comments on the tables. They would, of course, become less meaningful if one could give credence to another popular assumption: they should be doing well; they're the best students in the class; why aren't they doing better? It's difficult to meet this kind of argument squarely. I can say that I regard it as a misconception. I spend a good deal of time trying to disenchant certain of the students themselves on this score; and I think false expectations are created when the Faculty gives the theory credence. By the quantitative measures we have, Advanced Standing students can be identified not by the level of their measured intelligence, their test scores and the like, but by the schools they were lucky enough to attend. They are in fact better prepared, perhaps a little more sophisticated, and they come from our best secondary schools; they are not necessarily, however, the brightest students in the class.

Finally, I am aware that all these figures relate to only one dimension, that of measured academic performance. Nothing has been said about whether these students — *summa* or not — have had the kind of education we wish to offer, or whether they are "tragic cases" for reasons not reflected in this somewhat pedestrian review of their grade record. The record, however, is an important place to begin — if only to make it clear that the products of this Program are doing well at Harvard by the only measurable standards we have with which to identify a successful undergraduate career. And I for one am inescapably drawn to the conclusion that they are doing well *because* of the Program and the thrust toward excellence that it engenders — not in spite of it.

The tables, then, taken all together, give me, at least, considerable

reassurance about the original objectives of the Program of Advanced Standing. After seven years we know that there has been healthy growth in the Program and academic success among those who have taken part in it. This leaves us free to turn to an investigation of our experience with Advanced Standing in so far as it tells us something about general patterns in undergraduate education at Harvard. I have long felt that most of the problems and most of the issues of educational policy affecting all undergraduates are concentrated and given high visibility in Advanced Standing. The Program has a way of focusing issues: for example, the question of admissions policy discussed on this floor recently. A three-year option, if it were afforded to a greater proportion of the class, might vitally affect our discussion of the size of the College. Issues of concentration and General Education, concerns about excessive specialization, college-wide problems that relate to change of field — all have a way of gaining magnitude in the Advanced Standing Program. I'd like to point up several of these problems.

I have always been surprised that those colleges with a two-year rather than a three-year concentration have not developed more effective programs of Advanced Standing. At Harvard this is our most vexing problem. There is a sharp division between our upper-class years and our Freshman year, which is by and large a year of General Education, a year to explore unknown fields, a year to gain insight into the nature of undergraduate concentration here. It could well be argued that we have given away the wrong year — because in fact the high school advanced placement course is generally a first course in concentration, and none can be regarded as comparable to our lower-level offerings in General Education. But it is equally true that a Harvard undergraduate concentration, particularly since we introduced a required program of Sophomore tutorial, is a linked three-year program and not easily broken.

Advanced Standing students, then, must enter a field in their first year of residence, and some of them probably enter the wrong field, perhaps for the wrong reasons. But, of course, so do many other undergraduates.

The facts about field of concentration among Advanced Standing students are surprising. In my last report I postulated that we would probably not see a very wide distribution of fields among the Advanced Standing students — they would have too little experience to be able to choose unknowns. Yet of the thirty-four fields in which undergraduates were concentrating last June, thirty were represented by Advanced Standing concentrators — for the most part in roughly the same proportions as the rest of the class.

There are notable exceptions. Mathematics and Physics enroll new Sophomores in much greater proportion than regular concentrators. A restricted field, History and Literature, claims one out of ten Advanced Standing students — almost one quarter of all the concentrators in that

field. Social Relations draws few; none are in Geology; the proportions in Economics and Government are down. All in all there are proportionally more Sophomore Standing students in the Natural Sciences than is true of the College as a whole.

I am not sure this is a situation that needs correction, nor am I certain how we might change it. I know some departmental chairmen and some head tutors are sufficiently opposed on principle to Sophomore Standing to have told potential concentrators either to turn down their Advanced Standing or to concentrate elsewhere. This has a tendency to reduce concentrators in the field.

One of the anomalies in the question of concentration is that Advanced Standing students have an opportunity not afforded other undergraduates to change fields, simply by planning to stay four years and in effect repeating a Sophomore or a Junior year program in a new field. And yet they are reluctant to do so. I think this, as I suggested before, is not so much a commentary on Advanced Standing students as a reflection of the climate of opinion in the undergraduate body as a whole. Change of field, particularly in tutorial fields, most especially in those with Junior generals, is not easy at Harvard and generally not encouraged. It is interesting to observe that when a Sophomore Standing student has changed fields and opted for a fourth year, the change is often referred to as a failure in the Program. I prefer to believe that the boy has made a successful choice of field utilizing an option we have left open for him.

A final note on this. I originally expected that Advanced Standing students, choosing a field of concentration in September of their first year, would be particularly bewildered and uninformed. I think they often are. But my experience in the Freshman Dean's Office and some years as a Freshman adviser leads me to believe that they are really not much worse off than Freshmen who must make the same decision in April. Remarkably little is known about particular fields by Sophomores whether they have been at Harvard a year or not. The pattern, I think, is generally the same. A student knows the *area* of his interest but is not certain whether he prefers, for example, history or government or economics. I think many Freshman advisers tend to help a boy choose almost at random, and I think the nature of the concentration at Harvard is such that these students tend to stay in the field chosen, again perhaps for the wrong reasons.

I am certain, Mr. President, that if there is one thing this Faculty devoutly desires, it is a moratorium on Faculty legislation governing tutorial. At the same time I would suggest that if some way could be devised to offer *area* rather than *field* tutorial in the Sophomore year, not only Advanced Standing students but other Sophomores as well might move more effectively into a field appropriate for them.

The rapidity with which Advanced Standing students must choose a field is one problem. The degree to which even those who choose wisely

may be overspecializing is another. Here again, a mythology is current that needs some adjustment in the light of the facts. It has been assumed that in a college undergraduate body straining toward preprofessional specialization and held in check by our rules governing General Education, the Advanced Standing students, for whom many of these rules are waived, have disappeared in their first month here into a department and have emerged three or four years later, graduate students before their time, without a liberal education. A problem of definition is posed here. In so far as a liberal education is defined exclusively in terms of our lower-level offerings in General Education, Advanced Standing students, required as they are to take only one, are probably deficient. The Committee on General Education is, I understand, concerned about this and in the process of discussing it.

If, however, a liberal education can be measured in terms of distribution, in courses taken not only outside of a student's field but outside of his area, then the signs are more encouraging. It should be said at the outset that once we have allowed an option to graduate in three years, we have left little room for a student to exercise his willingness to go far afield. Most of the Advanced Standing students are honors candidates, and most honors programs require seven, some eight, courses for concentration. This leaves only four or five courses a student can take without regard to departmental requirements. Even so, the Advanced students have thus far demonstrated a reasonable distribution of their course load.

Our plan of General Education requires a total of six full courses outside a student's field, five of which must be outside his area. Leaving aside the fact that one lower-level course will fall within the area of concentration, the plan calls for 31 per cent of a student's work to be in courses outside his area. Of the Advanced Standing students who have graduated in three years, those in Area A have taken exactly 31 per cent of their work out of their area, Social Science concentrators have taken 42 per cent out, Humanities 32 per cent. Among the students who have opted for a fourth year, the natural scientists have taken 44 per cent of their work out of area, B 41 per cent, C 34 per cent. These statistics do not meet the issue of the lower-level General Education courses; they do suggest that the *distribution* of courses is commensurate with our standards. Moreover, when one examines the actual number of courses taken in one area, one finds that the three-year natural scientists have taken 8.4 full courses, social scientists 7.1, Humanities concentrators 8.4 These courses have generally been required for an honors concentration in the department. The charge that Advanced Standing students are overspecialized is a serious one. The facts seem to show that most of them are no more specialized than they are required to be.

It is probably true that the level of specialization, measured by graduate courses taken in fulfillment of an A.B. degree, is higher for Advanced Standing students — especially in the Natural Sciences, where sequence

is involved. This fact points up an interesting — and perhaps ultimately troublesome — development in the undergraduate curriculum during the past few years. Initially departments responded to the new levels of preparation in the undergraduate body by placement into higher-level courses, willing that a student should be working in graduate courses during his last year in college — some of these courses creditable toward a graduate degree. In short, advanced placement was being used toward acceleration. Advanced Standing students who had completed an undergraduate concentration were encouraged to move on into graduate studies, sometimes to graduate and get on with a higher degree.

Recently some departments have begun to introduce sequences of undergraduate concentration especially designed to serve the needs of the well prepared. There are notable examples in the new Chemistry 11 sequence and in the special honors concentration being prepared by the Division of Engineering and Applied Physics. My observations are not intended to gainsay the obvious advantages of a sufficiently challenging undergraduate curriculum, but to point up what I regard to be some of the implications of this trend. In the first place it suggests a move away from the concept of acceleration. A student who elects to take calculus in high school is in effect not anticipating college-level work and perhaps closing the gap on a higher degree or career. He will be anticipating the prerequisites of a special honors program that might otherwise be closed or delayed for him. This trend may bear thought, for it may inadvertently have effects not intended. We run the risk of making what could easily become the "real" concentration (a sequence assuming advanced placement prerequisites) available only to the economically or socially privileged sector of our incoming class. I can offer little encouragement that advanced placement work will be extended to all the thousands of schools from which we will wish to draw our undergraduate body. If this is true, we could conceivably reach a day when we find what we have thus far studiously avoided — a sharp split in the undergraduate body, one half of whom, by virtue of advanced placement, are being welcomed into super-honors programs, while the other half, admitted from non-AP schools, are taking what in effect will be remedial work: Chemistry 1, Math 1a, French 20, History 61. We might indeed find ourselves with a Program of Retarded Standing offering a fifth year to students who have to complete in *college* the college-level work many of their peers have taken in high school.

The issue of acceleration brings me to my concluding remarks. You will remember that this report began with a specter of growth that may or may not have been alarming. I pointed to the fact that although we may have approached the upper limit of students coming to us from Advanced Placement schools, we could expect an increasing number of those students to meet our standards for Sophomore standing. I did not complete my comments on the first table, because I failed to point

out what many must have noticed — that as the number of students eligible for Sophomore standing increases the percentage of those accepting it has gone down. In 1959 there were 55 students eligible for Sophomore standing and 55 accepted. This year 134 were eligible and 32 of them were talked out of accepting.

I talked them out of it. We have gained experience, and we know where the pitfalls of the Program lie. In some cases the advanced placement work a student brings to Harvard is not of a sort to equip him to enter a particular field as a Sophomore. For others the Freshman year, as it is now designed, seems particularly appropriate. But at the same time that I have attempted to exercise judgment in particular cases, I have increasingly tended to argue against Sophomore standing and against acceleration, partially because it makes for a more lively interchange with these young Turks and partially because I have come to believe that it is the general will of this Faculty that the Program should be held in check. These students, although they are offered the opportunity to leave after three years, should be cajoled or coerced into serving their full term. I can do this either by talking students into turning down Sophomore standing or by convincing them that they should remain in the College for a fourth year — perhaps to demonstrate their loyalty.

I put this ironically so that the Faculty may meet the issue squarely. We did not debate the question of acceleration in 1954. We meant to encourage secondary schools in a new educational endeavor and were not asked to consider the implications of a Program in which students could complete our undergraduate program, win our Sheldons and Fulbrights, join Phi Beta Kappa, enter our graduate schools, after three years. We tend to look with special favor on those Advanced Standing students who elect to remain for a fourth year, whose programs, were I to rehearse them, would argue a flexibility in undergraduate education that may well be the most impressive and least expected result of the Program.

But the satisfaction we may take in the fact that some students are eligible for Sophomore standing and can be persuaded to turn it down, or in the realization that others remain in Harvard after they have demonstrated their capacity, by our standards, to move on, is perhaps not reason enough to dissuade a boy from going $3000 more in debt to remain with us, or to argue against an earlier M.D. or Ph.D. We have learned in these seven years that some of the substance of what we have to offer can be anticipated elsewhere and with results that are impressive by the standards we use. We know, at this point at least, that students in Advanced Standing can leave us after three years with records that do them credit, or after four years with a flexibility in their undergraduate work not now part of our undergraduate program. We can expand this or curtail it. There is a chance that it might some day extend to half the class. And I am not sure whether this is alarming or not.

Edward T. Wilcox, Director

OVERALL GROWTH OF ADVANCED PLACEMENT AT HARVARD COLLEGE, 1955–1961

Year Entered	Total No. Schools	Total No. Candidates	Candidates Receiving AP	Total Exams Presented	Total No. Awards	Eligible for Soph Std	Accepted Soph Std
1955	39	146	81	193	98	2	2
1956	49	181	122	370	177	13	13
1957	80	264	179	529	295	33	33
1958	116	366	273	738	454	55	55
1959	152	455	386	1119	716	97	84
1960	184	530	398	1349	737	96	88
1961	215	540	452	1396	906	134	102

PERFORMANCE OF STUDENTS WITH ADVANCED PLACEMENT WHO ENTERED SEQUENT MIDDLE-GROUP COURSES IN THEIR FIRST YEAR OF RESIDENCE

		A	*B*	*C*	*D*	*E*	*Total*			*A*	*B*	*C*	*D*	*E*	*Total*
History	'55	2	3	0	0	0	5	*Spanish*	'55	0	0	0	0	0	0
	'56	4	16	3	1	1	25		'56	0	3	0	0	0	3
	'57	1	23	7	1	0	32		'57	0	2	0	1	0	3
	'58	3	41	17	0	0	61		'58	0	0	0	0	0	0
	'59	10	42	29	1	0	82		'59	0	3	0	0	0	3
	'60	9	25	8	2	0	44		'60	2	0	0	0	0	2
	Total	29	150	64	5	1	249		Total	2	8	0	1	0	11
Biology	'55	2	3	4	0	0	9	*German*	'55	0	0	1	0	0	1
	'56	0	6	4	0	0	10		'56	0	2	1	0	0	3
	'57	0	2	0	0	0	2		'57	2	0	0	0	0	2
	'58	2	3	1	1	0	7		'58	0	0	0	0	0	0
	'59	0	0	0	0	0	0		'59	0	5	1	0	0	6
	'60	1	1	2	0	0	4		'60	0	2	0	0	0	2
	Total	5	15	11	1	0	32		Total	2	9	3	0	0	14
Chem.	'55	3	0	0	0	0	3	*Greek*	'55	1	1	0	0	0	2
	'56	2	4	0	0	0	6		'56	1	4	1	0	0	6
	'57	6	9	10	1	0	26		'57	5	3	0	0	1	9
	'58	3	9	7	0	2	21		'58	4	0	0	0	0	4
	'59	12	14	6	0	0	32		'59	3	0	0	0	0	3
	'60	8	21	8	0	0	37		'60	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	34	57	31	1	2	125		Total	14	8	1	0	1	24

Physics	'55	0	0	2	0	0	2	*Latin*	'55	0	0	0	0	0	0
	'56	0	0	0	0	0	0		'56	0	0	0	0	0	0
	'57	2	2	1	0	0	5		'57	2	2	0	0	0	4
	'58	5	4	7	2	0	18		'58	2	1	1	0	0	4
	'59	6	8	5	3	0	22		'59	2	4	2	0	1	9
	'60	13	11	7	1	0	32		'60	1	2	0	0	1	4
	Total	26	25	22	6	0	79		Total	7	9	3	0	2	21
Math	'55	18	11	6	1	0	36	*Music*	'55	0	0	0	0	0	0
	'56	20	11	15	4	3	53		'56	2	2	0	2	0	6
	'57	38	34	31	6	2	111		'57	4	3	0	0	0	7
	'58	68	63	43	8	3	185		'58	4	2	0	0	0	6
	'59	107	76	49	10	1	243		'59	0	12	2	0	0	14
	'60	95	79	49	8	3	234		'60	0	2	0	0	0	2
	Total	346	274	193	37	12	862		Total	10	21	2	2	0	35
French	'55	2	0	0	0	0	2	*English*	'55	0	2	3	0	0	5
	'56	5	3	1	0	0	9		'56	5	11	7	0	0	23
	'57	2	0	1	0	0	3		'57	3	9	0	1	0	13
	'58	0	5	0	0	0	5		'58	7	23	9	0	0	39
	'59	3	4	0	0	0	7		'59	16	28	20	2	9	75
	'60	4	21	4	0	0	29		'60	3	27	9	2	1	42
	Total	16	33	6	0	0	55		Total	34	100	48	5	10	197

	A	*B*	*C*	*D*	*E*	*Total*
Grand Total	525	709	384	58	28	1704
Per cent	30.8	41.6	22.5	3.4	1.7	100.0

PER CENT OF STUDENTS IN EACH RANK LIST GROUP, 1955–1961, A COMPARISON

1ST YEAR

	I	*II*	*III*	*IV*	*V*	*VI*	*UNS*	*WD*	
Soph. Std.	6.6	24.5	31.4	19.7	10.9	0.4	5.8	0.7	N=274
Not Soph. Std.	2.6	13.3	25.2	27.4	20.0	1.0	8.8	1.7	N=6315

2ND YEAR

	I	*II*	*III*	*IV*	*V*	*VI*	*UNS*	*WD*	
Soph. Std.	9.7	28.5	28.5	17.2	4.8	0.0	6.5	4.8	N=186
Not Soph. Std.	1.9	11.3	24.0	26.6	16.9	1.3	13.1	4.9	N=5667

3RD YEAR

	I	*II*	*III*	*IV*	*V*	*VI*	*UNS*	*WD*	
Soph. Std.	11.1	28.9	24.5	15.6	6.7	4.4	4.4	4.4	N=45
Not Soph. Std	3.2	14.3	27.4	27.4	14.4	0.9	8.6	3.8	N=4236

GRADUATION

	Summa	*Magna H'est*	*Magna*	*Cum*	*A.B.*	*Lost Degree*	
Soph. Std. (3 & 4 years)	8.5	2.8	36.6	33.8	18.3	0.0	N=71
Not Soph. Std.	2.6	0.9	13.1	22.3	57.6	3.5	N=3265

GRADUATED ADVANCED STANDING STUDENTS

Year Graduated	*Name*	*Degree*	*Field*
1958	BRECK, Henry R.	MAGNA*	History & Literature
1959	BIENSTOCK, Paul A.	CUM*	Biochemical Sciences
	BROOKS, Peter P.	MAGNA*	History & Literature
	EAKIN, Paul J.	MAGNA*	History & Literature
	FIELD, Daniel	CUM*	History & Literature
	HARRISON, Robert C.	CUM*	History
	ORAM, Peter D.	CUM*	History
	SACHAR, David B.	MAGNA*	History
	SEGRE, Gino D. C.	MAGNA	Physics
	SHAPIRO, Robert B.	A.B.*	History & Literature
1960	ABRAMOVITZ, Michael J.	A.B.	Math
	BAKER, Gordon Park	MAGNA	Math
	BECKER, Richard E.	CUM*	History
	BOCKHAUS, James R.	CUM*	Eng. & Applied Physics
	BOOKIN, Alan S.	A.B.*	Psychology
	BOURNE, Henry R., Jr.	CUM*	History & Science
	BURNHAM, Philip E., Jr.	CUM*	History
	CARDONA, Francisco	A.B.*	Government
	DARNTON, Robert C.	MAGNA*	History & Literature
	GLICK, Thomas F.	MAGNA	History & Science
	HOBBS, Ranald D.	MAGNA*	History
	HODGES, Laurent	SUMMA*	Chemistry & Physics
	McCALL, Marsh H., Jr.	MAGNA*	Classics
	McLANE, Jonathan T.	A.B.*	Architectural Sciences
	MAHONEY, Michael S.	MAGNA*	History & Science
	MILLS, Nicolaus C.	CUM*	History & Literature
	MOORE, Charles B.	MAGNA*	Chemistry
	MOTTAHEDEH, Roy W. P.	MAGNA*	History
	ROSENKRANZ, Stephen M.	MAGNA	Economics
	SCHROEDER, William E., Jr.	MAGNA	English
	THOMPSON, William K.	CUM*	History & Literature
	WHITESIDES, George M.	MAGNA*	Chemistry
1961	AUERBACH, Philip H.	MAGNA*	Anthropology
	BAUM, Thomas H.	A.B.*	Mathematics
	BRADY, Jeremiah	A.B.*	History & Literature
	BROWN, Meredith	SUMMA*	History
	CARTER, Andrew M.	CUM*	English

Year Graduated	*Name*	*Degree*	*Field*
1961	CASHMAN, Frank A.	A.B.*	Government
(*cont.*)	DICKINSON, Robert E.	CUM*	Chemistry & Physics
	FELS, Stephen B.	MAGNA*	Physics
	FINLAYSON, Ian E.	CUM*	History & Literature
	FREEMAN, Smith, Jr.	SUMMA	Chemistry & Physics
	GATES, Henry P., Jr.	MAGNA H.	Classics
	GODFREY, Henry P.	CUM*	Biochemical Sciences
	HALPERIN, Bertrand I.	SUMMA*	Physics
	HARRISON, Joseph A.	MAGNA	Mathematics
	HIGGINS, John S., Jr.	CUM*	Government
	IRONS, Alden H.	MAGNA*	History
	KRIPKE, Daniel F.	MAGNA*	English
	LEVIN, David M.	CUM*	Philosophy
	LEWIS, Gene L.	A.B.*	Mathematics
	LIEBHAFSKY, Douglas S.	MAGNA*	English
	LINBURN, Geoffrey E.	A.B.	Philosophy
	LIVINGTON, David M.	CUM*	History
	MENDELSOHN, Richard	CUM	Physics
	MIDDLEBROOK, Jonathan	MAGNA*	English
	MILLER, Ralph E.	SUMMA	Mathematics
	MOORE, Dennis W.	CUM*	Mathematics
	MOOSE, James S., 3d	MAGNA*	Economics
	MYRAVAAGNES, Eric P.	A.B.	Mathematics
	NEUSWANGER, R. Russell	CUM	Mathematics
	PULIER, Myron	A.B.*	Mathematics
	REEVES, Harvey V. K.	CUM	History & Literature
	SLOTE, Michael A.	MAGNA*	Philosophy & Soc. Rel.
	SMITH, Peter M.	MAGNA*	Classics
	STRIKIS, Andrejs R.	CUM*	Architectural Sciences
	SWITZER, Robert M., Jr.	MAGNA H.	Mathematics
	TUNNELL, James S.	CUM*	History
	VANDERWEIL, Raimund G.	CUM*	Eng. & Applied Physics
	WEISSKOPF, Thomas E.	SUMMA*	Economics
	ZEMO, August L.	A.B.*	English

* Indicates that the candidate graduated in three years.